

HONORING TUDOR CITY GREENS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my distinguished colleagues to honor the invaluable work of Tudor City Greens.

Tudor City Greens is a not-for-profit organization that maintains two parks within the Tudor City complex; one of New York City's most densely populated neighborhoods. Surrounded by the steel and glass of towering skyscrapers, these two parks have provided tranquility and beauty for the public's enjoyment since the late 1920's.

The importance of the parks to New York's quality of life was brought to the forefront when the very existence of the parks were threatened in 1972. That year a real estate developer bought the Tudor City complex and planned to build apartments on the parks. The community rallied against the developer and vehemently battled to save the parks. After a 15-year legal battle, the properties were sold to Time Equities who donated the parks to the Trust for Public Land. The parks were deemed only for recreational and cultural use and in 1988 Tudor City and its parks were designated an historic district by the Landmarks Preservation Commission in 1988.

Tudor City Greens was founded in January of 1987 by residents of the complex to preserve and maintain the parks. Since its conception, the organization has worked diligently to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to restore and maintain the parks. They have cultivated new gardens, initiated a tree care program and organized annual events such as Easter egg hunts, caroling and a Halloween parade.

On May 10, Tudor City Greens, will sponsor its Parks Celebration to focus the city's attention on the beauty of the parks, and the continuing efforts to preserve them. I would like to personally thank the directors of Tudor City Greens for their dedication and outstanding work in preserving one of New York's cultural treasures.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to Tudor City Greens for providing the citizens of New York with this emerald isle deep within the heart of New York.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. RANDY TATE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1995

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I had preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an amendment offered by myself, and my distinguished colleague, Representative MIKE PARKER, to H.R. 961, the Clean Water Amendments of 1995.

The explanation follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 961 TO RESOLVE THE TACOMA CASE BY INCLUDING STATE WATER QUALITY RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE FERC LICENSING PROCESS—EXPLANATION

The purpose of this amendment is to address the serious concerns that the Supreme

Court's 1994 Tacoma decision are creating for the nation's hydropower projects. These projects are the leading source of clean, renewable electric energy in this country. But they are operating under a cloud because the Supreme Court has interpreted the Clean Water Act, in particular section 401 of the Act, so broadly as to effectively supersede the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)'s licensing authority over the projects under the Federal Power Act.

This amendment would rectify that situation. It directs state water quality agencies to provide their Clean Water Act recommendations—for hydropower projects under the Commission's jurisdiction—to the Commission to consider under the Federal Power Act. Section 10(a) of the Federal Power Act requires FERC to conduct a lengthy, comprehensive review of both proposed hydropower projects and existing projects upon relicensing. That review focuses heavily on the potential environmental impacts of each project and best ways to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Furthermore, section 10(a) specifically requires the Commission to take into account the recommendations of state and federal agencies, Indian tribes, and the public. Therefore, in the context of hydropower projects under FERC's jurisdiction, it makes sense to fold state water quality agency recommendations into the comprehensive licensing process that already exists under the Federal Power Act. This amendment accomplishes that objective.

TRIBUTE TO CPL BRUCE BARDELL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished police officer who is retiring as a hero from the Allen Park, MI, Police Department. Cpl. Bruce Bardell was honored last month by the city he has served with bravery and skill for 29 years.

Since being wounded by a gunshot fired by a fleeing felon in 1978, Corporal Bardell has undergone four major surgeries, the most recent of which was in January of this year. I would like to share with my colleagues a little about the incident that led to this injury because it reveals much about the character of this officer, and the other officers on the Allen Park police force.

On June 3, 1978, Corporal Bardell was among the officers dispatched when a larceny was reported in the north end of the city. The suspects fled in a car. After the police gave chase, the suspects abandoned their vehicle and escaped through back yards on foot in the dark. When a resident reported a prowler, Officer Bardell responded. Upon arriving to the area of the report, he viewed a shadowy figure darting in a nearby yard, and gave chase on foot. Officer Bardell was surprised by a second suspect hiding behind a garage, who fired two shots at point blank range, striking Officer Bardell in the abdomen. He managed to return fire, striking the suspect, who was immobilized until other officers arrived on the scene.

Officer Bardell returned to duty following his recovery from his injuries, and I am pleased to be able to report that his assailant is still imprisoned, serving a 60- to 100-year term. However, I must also note that Corporal Bardell has suffered continuing health problems as a result of this craven criminal act.

Despite these problems, he has continued to serve with distinction and honor.

For his years of dedicated service to the people of Allen Park, for his bravery in the face of great danger, and for his record as a good and faithful citizen, I call upon my colleagues in the House to join me in saluting this great American.

MONEY TO BURN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you know, Arson Awareness Week, commemorating the end of the Los Angeles fires set during the 1992 riots, just ended, with communities all across the country focussing public attention on the terrible costs in lives and money from arson for profit. Arson Awareness Week has the support of firefighters around the Nation, many of whom have organized with consumers, government agencies and insurers to combat this form of insurance fraud through public information and the advocacy of such groups as the Coalition Against Insurance Fraud. The coalition recently published in its newsletter the following article, "Money To Burn", which I would like inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of our firefighters and the arson problem:

MONEY TO BURN

(By Michael E. Diegel)

ARSON-FOR-PROFIT AND ITS MANY FACES ARE A DANGEROUS—SOMETIMES DEADLY—FORM OF INSURANCE FRAUD

In 560 cases in 1993, someone's world ended just as biblical writers predicted—in a blaze of fire.

The 560 dead were the victims not of apocryphal wrath but of arson.

For at least 80 other people living in apartments above a New York warehouse, salvation came in the form of investigators who unearthed a plot to burn the warehouse for the insurance money.

There's no way to know how many of the 560 were killed in cases of arson for profit, but experts believe at least 15 percent of reported fires are deliberately set for several reasons, including insurance fraud and other profit-seeking motives.

"It's as difficult, or perhaps even more so, as determining the level of [other types of] insurance fraud," said Rick Gilman of the Insurance Committee for Arson Control. "It's perhaps more difficult because arson covers a wide variety of motives where generally insurance fraud is strictly for profit."

He defines arson for profit as "an intentionally set fire to recover some financial gain. Maybe it's financial gain through insurance proceeds, maybe it's financial gain through reducing the competition, maybe it's financial gain through some other avenue.

"There isn't any information as to how common it is," Gilman continued. "The whole issue is one that's very difficult to find out anything about because there hasn't been an effective study of that aspect of arson for over a decade."

A 1982 study of closed claims files from 1980 was conducted by the Insurance Research Council's organizational predecessor, Gilman said.

"In general, what they found in the voluntary [insurance] market, the percentage of